the "product" of the nervous mass of the brain in any sense of the word corresponding to that which we rightly apply to the various secretions of the body, involves us at once, it is held, in the grossest absurdities; while the theory that claims that *all* mental phenomena, whatever their varied characteristic shading, have exact equivalents, as it were, in specific forms of the nerve-commotion of the living brain is marked by its "surprising audacity." "Standing on a slender basis of real fact, it makes a leap into the dark which carries it centuries in advance of where the light of modern research is now clearly shining." The author, however, by no means rejects, he strongly contends for, a causal nexus as existing between brain and mind. He regards the term organ (or instrument) of the mind, as applied to the body, as particularly calculated to emphasize the relation of the ideas and volitions which arise in consciousness to the control of the muscular apparatus. He will have nothing to do with monism, but contends that psycho-physical science, simply observing the facts and building on them, establishes the dualism of brain and mind. "We affirm, then," he says, "that we are entitled to say: The changes of the brain are a *cause* of the states of consciousness; and the mind behaves as it does behave, *because* of the behaviour of the molecules of the brain." "We affirm also that we are equally entitled to say: The states of consciousness are a cause of the molecular condition and changes of the nervous mass of the brain, and through it of the other tissues and organs of the body."

So far, in dealing with the third part, we have perhaps made it appear that, in the author's view, the correlation is complete. And the passages we have quoted seem to justify this view. But many other passages reject such an interpretation with scorn. "In investigating the correlations which undoubtedly exist between the nervous mechanism and the phenomena of consciousness, it is found that some of these phenomena imply activities of the mind which do not admit, in any sense of the word, of being thus correlated." "Judgment itself is a form of mental phenomena for the essential part of which no physical equivalent can be discovered or even conceived of." "To account for this boundless expansion of the activities of consciousness (in the early years of childhood), with its surprising new factors and mysterious grounds of synthesis and assumption, by proposing an hypothesis of 'dynamical associations' among the particles of nervous substance in the brain, is a deification of impotency." . "Not one of the higher acts of feeling, knowing, or willing, so far as its *sui generis* character is concerned, admits of being correlated with, or represented under, any of the conceivable modes of the motion and relation of molecules of nervous substance."

It would seem, then, that the author plays rather fast and loose with this correlation, as indeed is apt to be the fashion with dualists. We doubt whether he is justified in saying that psycho-physical science establishes the dualism of brain and mind. Here, it seems to us, the writer's usual caution forsakes him. Idealism, materialism, occasionalism, dualism, monism, are none of them theories that are in any likelihood of being "established" for many a long day. They are of the nature of *beliefs*; and strong as is his advocacy of the dualistic creed the author falls into error if he dreams of its speedy establishment. We could wish that he had squarely faced the difficulties which the acceptance of the dualistic hypothesis entails, a few of which are but barely mentioned on page 597. These and many others may not be difficulties to him; but surely he who would establish a doctrine should meet half-way such difficulties as are likely to trouble unbelievers. We could wish, too, that he had given us a more detailed criticism of the monistic creed which he rejects. To ask *why* the double-faced unity (the human being) manifests itself both in physical and mental states—"one being, in two wholly incomparable modes of manifestation"—and to say that monism has to undertake the task of showing *how* the one reality can appear under these two phenomenal forms of being—matter and mind—is surely not a very powerful or acute criticism. There are many *hows* and *whys* which can only be answered by quietly pointing to the facts. We do not say that monism can in this way be "established"; but we regard the criticism as weak.

Nor are we impressed with the force of the argument upon which so much stress is laid, that for certain higher mental activities no physiological correlate can be conceived. It seems to us that, if anywhere, the inconceivability comes in at the very beginning. If once the conceivability of a correlation between a nerve-commotion of any kind and a state of consciousness be admitted, there need be no further talk of inconceivability in the matter. *There* lies the rub: elsewhere we only find questions of degree and of relative complexity.

We cannot take leave of this valuable and important work without expressing our sense of its ability, its thoroughness, and its candour. There is no other book in the English language that covers its ground.

C. LL. M.

OUR BOOK SHELF.

The Essentials of Histology. By E. A. Schäfer, F.R.S. Second Edition. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1887.)

THIS edition is, in several respects, an improvement on the first. The volume is less bulky, and there are some useful additions to the text so as to bring this up to date, especially as regards the methods of histological study. There are seventeen valuable illustrations added. The omission in the first edition of references to the authors of the illustrations has, we are glad to see, been corrected in this edition.

On the whole, we think the book a clear exposition of the present state of human histology, and, as such, it will prove useful to students and teachers. E. KLEIN.

Aluminium: its History, Occurrence, Properties, Metallurgy, and Applications, including its Alloys. By Joseph W. Richards. 12mo, pp. 346 (Philadelphia: Band. London: Sampson Low and Co. 1887.)

THIS volume is mainly a compilation based upon the late H. St. Claire Deville's treatise published in 1858, and the newer work by Dr. Mierzinski in Hartleben's "Chemisch-Technische Bibliothek," which appeared in 1883. As no special work on aluminium had previously appeared in English, we agree with the author that no apology is necessary in presenting it. The subject has been systematically treated both from the scientific and

© 1887 Nature Publishing Group

technical points of view, and as regards the latter the information has been brought up to date by including notices of Webster's improvements in the Deville process, Messrs. Cowles Brothers' electrolytic method of producing aluminium alloys, and the Castner process of reducing sodium from caustic soda at a low temperature, which, in conjunction with Webster's processes, seems likely to render the production of cheap aluminium commercially possible.

The author has contributed to the appendix a series of experiments made by himself on the formation and reduction of aluminium sulphide, which are of interest, although the results, in the reduction experiments at any rate, appear to have been mainly negative. Iron, tin, copper, and antimony were employed as reducing agents, but only with the first two metals was any reduction effected. The concluding paragraph, therefore, reads rather oddly:—"These processes have been covered by patents, but have never been made successful. It appears that if rightly managed they will give good results and produce aluminium alloys cheaply."

Questions on Physics. By Sydney Young, D.Sc., F.C.S., Lecturer on Chemistry, and Tutorial Lecturer on Physics in the University College, Bristol. (London: Rivingtons, 1887.)

ASSUMING that books consisting of a series of questions with their answers collected together at the end supply a legitimate want and do a real service in the cause of scientific education, Dr. Young's "Questions on Physics" is a valuable addition to those already existing. It is as free as it is possible to make such a book from the charge of encouraging "cram," as the questions are many of them not adapted to rule-of-thumb methods of solution. Many of them also are descriptive of some instrument or principle, in which case, of course, answers are not given. The author takes in succession mechanics, acoustics, heat, magnetism, electricity, and optics. After the answers he gives a series of tables which will be found useful. There are no questions on moment of inertia, or on the ballistic galvanometer. One sentence—the last part of question 155—may vex the student: "Calculate the focal length of a concave lens which gives a magnification of three diameters at a distance of three inches."

The book is intended for the intermediate examination in science and preliminary scientific examination of the London University.

Eminent Naturalists. By Thomas Greenwood, F.R.G.S. (London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co., 1886.)

THIS is a little book (200 small 8vo pages) intended, as the preface says, to furnish "short yet comprehensive sketches of some leading naturalists." The sketches are certainly "short," but can only be said to be "comprehensive" in the sense that this term may be applied to an epitaph. It is difficult to understand what object such very sketchy biographical sketches can be supposed to serve. Moreover, in this case the subjects appear to have been selected at random; the result being that the portrait gallery, such as it is, presents a somewhat incongruous assemblage—to wit, Linnæus, Lubbock, Thomas Edward, Louis Agassiz, Cuvier, Buffon, Lyell, and Mur chison. Whether this curious arrangement is intended to express the writer's idea of the order of merit of these men, or whether, like his choice of naturalists, it is purely haphazard, we are not informed. But surely, if a biographer goes back as far as Linnæus for his material, and carries down his survey to the present generation, even the most popular of popular readers might have expected him to supply a less deficient index of "eminent naturalists."

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

[The Editor does not hold himself responsible for opinions expressed by his correspondents. Neither can he undertake to return, or to correspond with the writers of, rejected manuscripts. No notice is taken of anonymous communications.

[The Editor urgently requests correspondents to keep their letters as short as possible. The pressure on his space is so great that it is impossible otherwise to insure the appearance even of communications containing interesting and novel facts.]

The Carnatic Rainfall.

IF I have rightly interpreted General Strachey's courteous criticism of my paper on the Carnatic rainfall, the gist of his objections may be summed up by saying that the method by which I endeavoured to estimate numerically the genuineness of the apparent cyclical variation of that rainfall, as a recurrent phenomenon, is logically invalid. This, I must frankly admit, is really the case; my error has been somewhat of the nature of a *petitio principii*, and is indefensible. I have reasoned upon a series of values directly obtained from the observations, as if they had been obtained deductively from some independent source, and had been found, on trial, to agree, within certain allowable limits, with the results of the observations. This procedure, as General Strachey has shown, is manifestly illogical; and the inferred "high probability that the apparent undecennial fluctuation of the Carnatic rainfall is no chance phenomenon," in so far as this conclusion depends on the above erroneous reasoning, necessarily falls to the ground. But only in so far. The validity of the data afforded by the registers remains, of course, unaffected; and these data, as they stand, seem to me to furnish evidence of so pronounced a character that it is at least improbable that the apparent fluctuation is fortuitous. The considerations on which I base this opinion are:—

(1) That each series of eleven years, taken separately, shows a dominant fluctuation of that period, and these fluctuations show much accordance, both in their ranges and in the epochs of their critical phases. Simple inspection of the tabulated annual means is sufficient to convince one that there is no regular fluctuation of anything like the same magnitude, differing much from the eleven-year period.

(2) The range of the fluctuation as educed by the harmonic formula (restricted to two periodical terms), is four times as great as the mean deviation of the recorded amounts from the corresponding computed values. And this fact fulfils a condition which, in a less rigorous form, General Strachey suggested, I believe,[1] as a test in his discussion of the Madras rainfall registers, communicated to the Royal Society in May 1877, and the failure of which he rightly assigned as a reason for doubting the reality of the supposed cyclical fluctuation of the Madras rainfall.

That the second of these considerations is valid has been established in my former communication. The computed range of the fluctuation was shown to be 14 inches, and the mean annual deviation of the observed from the computed values ± 3·5 inches. To render the first more obvious, I have computed the harmonic constants, separately, from each of the two undecennial series, and therefrom the annual values in each case. The constants are:—

1st Cycle.	2nd Cycle.
$u' = 7{\cdot}23$ ... $u'' = 0{\cdot}66$	$u' = 4{\cdot}22$ ... $u'' = 5{\cdot}44$
$U' = 190^\circ\ 16'$ ... $U'' = 322^\circ\ 10'$	$U' = 233^\circ\ 59'$ ... $U'' = 240^\circ\ 14'$

and the computed annual values—

1st Cycle.	Inches.	2nd Cycle.	Inches.
1864	− 1·70	1875	− 8·14
1865	− 4·62	1876	− 8·63
1866	− 6·35	1877	− 2·61
1867	− 6·62	1878	+ 3·46
1868	− 4·99	1879	+ 3·69
1869	− 1·39	1880	+ 0·07
1870	+ 3·18	1881	− 1·46
1871	+ 6·79	1882	+ 2·11
1872	+ 7·23	1883	+ 6·71
1873	+ 5·81	1884	+ 5·97
1874	+ 2·12	1885	− 1·04

---

[1] I quote from memory, not having the Proc. Roy. Soc. at hand.

© 1887 Nature Publishing Group